

Application No.: 09/785,872
Response to Office Action dated: January 03, 2005
Response dated: March 2, 2005

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed January 3, 2005.

I. Summary of Examiners Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 3, 2005, Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-32 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action mailed January 3, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 21-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,149). The Examiner also rejected Claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani in view of Macready et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0016759, hereafter Macready).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 11, 21, 22, 31 and 32, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-32. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed January 3, 2005, Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 21-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system for handling messages, comprising:*

a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants;

a router that validates each message received from a participant at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores the message for subsequent delivery via the transport to those participants;

a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages from the transport to the router, and from the router to the transport;

a manager that manages the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub; and,

a repository that stores management data, wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle said messages.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that the collaboration hub comprises a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants; a router that validates each message received from a participant at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores the message for subsequent delivery via the transport to those participants; a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages from the transport to the router and from the router to the transport; and a manager that manages the flow of messages across the hub. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

Notani discloses a system and process allowing collaboration within and between enterprises for optimal decision making. Notani apparently discloses a system having a computer implemented process that includes designing a workflow and instantiating the workflow such that at least one activity is tailored to a particular node in the node group. The process then involves deploying the workflow including distributing the activities over the nodes in the node group, and executing the workflow to provide multi-enterprise collaboration. (Column 2, Lines 16-21). As shown in Fig. 5, the global collaboration workspace provides the primary entity used to share data/objects between the various entities in the collaboration. In general, objects can be placed into the global collaboration workspace by one entity, and retrieved by another entity. (Column 5, Lines 20-28). The global collaboration workspace can be organized a hierarchy of slots, and can be

considered a fast, secure, in-memory object database, with security and messaging capabilities. Persistent slots hold their data in stable storage. Writing and retrieval from persistent slots is slower than for in-memory slots, but data is not lost if the global collaboration workspace goes down. (Column 5, Lines 32-47). This makes the global collaboration workspace appropriate as a high speed data sharing mechanism. (Column 5, Lines 51-54).

Applicant respectfully submits that, from the above description, the system disclosed by Notani appears to be a global shared data storage facility into which an entity or participant places objects, while another or the same entity subsequently retrieves the object. This is different from the embodiment of the invention defined by Claim 1 in which the collaboration hub receives messages from participants and sends those messages to other participants. Specifically, Claim 1, as currently amended, defines the hub as comprising a router that validates each message received from a participant at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores the message for subsequent delivery via the transport to those participants.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Notani fails to teach a scheduler in collaboration workspace that schedules the flow of messages from transport to the router and from the router to the transport. As described above, it appears that Notani discloses that a global collaboration workspace can share data/objects between various entities in the collaboration and the workspace interfaces with the global collaboration managers, local system, etc., wherein objects can be placed into the global collaboration workspace by one entity and retrieved by another entity. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a different process from a flow of messages, or scheduling of a flow of messages from transport to router, and from router to the transport within the collaboration workspace.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Notani, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 21, 22, 31 and 32

Claims 21, 22, 31 and 32 have been amended similarly to Claim 1, to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. For similar reasons as given above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23-30

Claims 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23-30 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23-30 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed January 3, 2005, Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani in view of Macready.

Claims 9 and 19

Claims 9 and 19 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 19 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Application No.: 09/785,872
Response to Office Action dated: January 03, 2005
Response dated: March 2, 2005

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2005

By: 

Karl F. Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800